

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DAVID A. STEBBINS,
Plaintiff,

v.

KARL POLANO, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. 21-cv-04184-JSW

**ORDER REGARDING MOTION FOR
CLARIFICATION AND
ADMONISHMENT TO PLAINTIFF**

Re: Dkt. No. 135

On April 13, 2022, Plaintiff filed a motion requesting clarification of the Court's order regarding the voluntary dismissal of the Corporate Defendants. (Dkt. No. 134.) The Court clarifies that it will not consider the motion to dismiss filed by the Corporate Defendants. (*See* Dkt. No. 129.) The Court has stricken the motion to dismiss, which means it is removed from the record. The Court denies Plaintiff's remaining requests for clarification. The Court also denies Plaintiff's request to submit supplemental briefing.

Plaintiff improperly noticed his motion for clarification for a hearing on Friday, April 15, 2022. Plaintiff's scheduled hearing date violates Local Rule 7-2, which requires motions be noticed for hearing not less than 35 days after the filing of the motion. *See* N.D. Civ. L.R. 7-2. The Court VACATES the hearing scheduled for Friday, April 15, 2022.

//

//

//

//


//

//

1 The Court ADMONISHES Plaintiff to properly file and notice his motions in the future.
2 Plaintiff must consult the Local Rules and Judge White's Scheduling Notes, which can be found at
3 www.cand.uscourts.gov/judges/jsw/ to ensure he schedules motions for open and available dates.
4 Plaintiff will be required to re-notice any improperly noticed motions in the future.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: April 14, 2022

7 
8 JEFFREY S. WHITE
9 United States District Judge
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28